

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/785,815	02/16/2001	Yeuk-Fai Edwin Mok	4969/USA/ISM/COPPER/SB 4127		
32588	7590 11/08/2004		EXAMINER		
APPLIED MATERIALS, INC.			CULBERT, ROBERTS P		
	BLVD. M/S 2061 ARA, CA 95050		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
or in the CES	,		1763		
			DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004	DATE MAILED: 11/08/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	, ,
Advisory Action	09/785,815	MOK ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Roberts Culbert	1763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addi	ress
THE REPLY FILED 15 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avifinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ation. A proper reply n places the applica	y to a tion in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of 1 (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THe date on which the petition under 37 CFI f extension and the corresponding amount should be shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejection IE FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the apprount of the fee. The appropriationally set in the final (on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	elow);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sin	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims	s.
NOTE:			1
$3. \square$ Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed a	amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT	Γ place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY to	o issues which were	newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendments explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed:			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8, 10, 12, 13 and 23</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ appr	oved or b) disapproved by the	ne Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	it(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		•
10.		2	F / Y
	E		

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Applicant's arguments filed 10/15/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant has argued that U.S. Patent 6,551,488 to Hey et al. and U.S. Patent 4,489,740 do not teach the limitations as recited in Claims 1 and 3.

Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

Applicant's arguments do not comply with 37 CFR 1.111(c) because they do not clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. Further, they do not show how the amendments avoid such references or objections.

R. Culbert A. Cullet